

Date: Tue, 8 Nov 94 04:30:16 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #523
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 8 Nov 94 Volume 94 : Issue 523

Today's Topics:

5wpm in 5days (or your money back!)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 08 Nov 1994 01:13:06 GMT
From: rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister)
Subject: 5wpm in 5days (or your money back!)

In article <Cypy7w.J9s@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>Five days to get to 5wpm? I guess that just about kills the ``It's
>too difficult'' argument!

Would seem to kill the "it's there so a license requires effort" argument
too. That leaves the "code requirement makes us look like Neanderthals"
argument, at least.

--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Sun, 6 Nov 1994 04:44:16 GMT
From: veltman@netcom.com (paul Veltman)

References<9410230400083420@pcappbbs.com> <Cy4yx7.8r3@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<RFM.940ct24155951@urth.eng.sun.com>
Subject: Re: Real Hams

Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:
: In article <Cy4yx7.8r3@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

: >dale.piedfort@pcappbbs.com (Dale Piedfort) writes:
: >
: >>THREE:
: >>
: >>THE AMATEUR IS PROGRESSIVE....He keeps his station abreast of science.
: >>It is well-built and efficient. His operating practice is above re-
: > ^^^^^^^^^^
Abrest of science??? Does that mean that I'm going to have to give up my
KWM-2A, 51J4 and 32V3 and get some crummy rice box?
Jeff, grab the tar and feathers!

Paul WA6OKQ

Date: Fri, 04 Nov 1994 16:12:00 EST
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<5I43j6Y.wcoyle@delphi.com> <391f98\$ipr@newsbf01.news.aol.com>,
<Cypy7w.J9s@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: 5wpm in 5days (or your money back!)

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>joen9yjj@aol.com (Joe N9YJZ) writes over on r.r.a.misc:
>
>> Well...it guess is possible to learn 13wpm in 2 weeks. I learned 5wpm
>>in 5 days....and got 10/10 on my code test not to mention perfect copy.
>>Not saying that it couldn't be done..but the fact is that many don't even
>>use the code once they've passed the test. I almost see the code as
>>somewhat of a screener for the "losers" in the radio hobby. Im also not
>>saying that its worthless. I have used the code nearly every day since I
>>recieved my license and ill say thats its been worth every minute of it.
>>The no-codes should be very happy with what they have..and screaming for
>>more will just inflame many of the dedicated HF opeartors who don't want
>>to see their band go to hell.
>>
>>Joe, N9YJZ
>

>Five days to get to 5wpm? I guess that just about kills the ``It's
>too difficult'' argument!
>
>Jeff NH6IL

Yep, proves that one person out of a sampling of one can do it. Better
trot over and retake that Statistics 101 class Jeff, before you work on
your doctorate any more. You are in serious trouble, Pal.

"I almost see the code as somewhat of a screener for the "losers"
in the radio hobby."

Lid filter in action Jeff? I had to so you have to? The Real Reason(tm)?

Dan N8PKV

--

Not one single person has been prosecuted as a result of the Brady Law.
- Asst. Atty. Gen. Jo Ann Harris
No decline in crime has been noted. - BATF Assoc. Dir. Charles Thompson
7 Months and Counting..... (Stay tuned for "The Big Lie - Part II)

Date: Mon, 07 Nov 1994 09:53:42 -0500
From: CSLE87@ucsd.edu (Karl Beckman)

References<396mun\$j39@hpbab.wv.mentorg.COM>
<1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu>, <39b9ag\$tk@hpbab.wv.mentorg.COM>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <39b9ag\$tk@hpbab.wv.mentorg.COM>, hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank
Oredson) wrote:

> In article <1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu>, sww@csuohio.edu (Steve
Wolf) writes:
> |> Hank Oredson (hanko@wv.mentorg.com) wrote:
> |> : Nope, because AX.25, by it's very nature, is not used for one-
> |> : way communications. Oh yes, you might say, it COULD be
> |> : (there are UI frames!), but it's not.
> |> :
> |>
> |> But is is broadcasting none the less.
> |>
> |> I think it was Todd Little that that quoted the definition of broadcasting.
> |>
> |> From Part 97.3(a) ... (10) ... Broadcasting - Transmissions intended for
> |> reception by the general public, either direct or relayed.
>

> Steve, try real hard here ... read the above ... about "transmissions"
> and "general public" and "intended". Give it a shot, you can probably
> figure out what those words mean.
>
> |>
> |> Clearly, a BBS phone port with an anonymous check-in allows the public
> |> access to relayed transmissions. There are LOTS of phone ports that
> |> allow anonymous check-ins.
>
> Wrong. It allows the public (if the sysop so chooses) access to some
> files on a computer. Has nothing (zilch, zip, nada) to do with
> "transmissions" or "broadcasting" or for that matter "radio", not to
> mention "amateur radio".
>
> Try really hard Steve, this is NOT rocket science.
> The words really do mean just what they say. Amazing!
>
> |> So, originators of bulletins which are sent by any means to a BBS that has
> |> a public phone port that are not about amateur radio would fall under
> |> broadcasting.
>
> Would you like to run this by me again?
>

It's not that difficult a concept, Hank. Internet conversations which are being run over amateur radio are true "broadcasting", exactly as defined by the FCC. Those transmissions are not considered legal by the FCC field officer who generated the opinion quoted in the original (long time back) posting.

> |> Broadcasting does not require a one-way transmission. It would appear that
> |> an ax.25 connection between two stations can still be use for broadcasting.
>
> Um, how could that happen?

The mere fact that an amateur station requested the transmission does not automatically make it legal. Nor does it automatically convert a message posted to "WORLD" on the net into a valid amateur to amateur communication.

Remember the recent FCC blurb that holds the operator of the "first posting" entry point station responsible for message content and compliance.

>
> Steve, you are REAL confused here. Go back to the definitions section
> of part 97, and read that first. Make some notes on what the various
> technical terms ("transmissions", "broadcasting", "transmitted")
> mean, then read the above again.
>

> |> (Bet we are going to move on and say that a bulletin about quilting was
> |> targeted solely at the amateur population. Let me guess ... ANY bulletin
> |> entered on packet is to be assumed to be aimed solely at the amateur radio
> |> population.)
>
> Ah! You have GOT it at last!
>
> Who ELSE would an amateur station transmit this information to?
> In fact, it would not be legal for an amateur station to transmit
> this information to anyone BUT another ham.

Hank, this is NOT true when you start allowing cross-connection to the general public by using either an internet gateway or even phone dial ports to an amateur BBS. I believe that these are the situations that both the NOCALL 00 and Steve are addressing. From your comments it appears that IN THIS NARROW SITUATION (and most certainly NOT the broader general case of ALL amateur packet traffic) you would agree that Steve and the FCC are both correct.

Obviously the first target above is debatable; the second is a case where the rulemaker is being challenged, much like a small mouse antagonizing an elephant. That is probably not a good thing to do unless one wants to be stepped upon and find the transmission of all non-amateur originated broadcast messages prohibited, which is exactly what 97.3 says.

>
> By "targeted" you probably mean exactly the same thing that the FCC
> means with the term "intended" in part 97.3
>
> Simple, isn't it?
>
> I'm still curious what you are attempting to accomplish with the
> arguments you are making. What's your agenda?
>
> ... Hank
>
>
>
> --
>
> Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics Library Operations
> Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com "Parts 'R Us!"
> Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

I must side with Steve on the specific narrow case that I presented above. I am afraid that many within the amateur community have greatly over-stated their perceived importance in being part of the Information Superhighway, while the commercial providers feel that we are only a back alley. If the FCC takes away our interchange (both figurative and literal) we will have

neither advanced the state of the art or served the public interest.

--

Karl Beckman, P.E. <The difference between stupidity and >
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data <genius is that genius has its limits.>

Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI
The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.

Date: 5 Nov 1994 04:38:03 GMT
From: Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com

References<36i3sa\$gdg@scratchy.reed.edu> <39763a\$hk4@newsbf01.news.aol.com>,
<1994Nov4.033725.4699@mixcom.com>
Subject: Re: Amateur Radio - What is the logic behind it?

In article <1994Nov4.033725.4699@mixcom.com>,
kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> wrote:
>Well?

Hi Kevin, nowadays most of the logic is CMOS. :-)

--

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

Date: 7 Nov 1994 18:48:29 GMT
From: hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson)

References<396mun\$j39@hpbab.wv.mentorg.COM>
<1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu>, <39c3fh\$3te@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Reply-To: Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <39c3fh\$3te@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
writes:

|> Steve Wolf (sww@csuohio.edu) wrote:
|>
|> : But is is broadcasting none the less.

<remaining errent nonesense elided>

|> In the event you are serious in your interpretations of the rules, do you
|> plan to close down your operations on tcp/ip and public pbbs stations?

<most of the reasonable response also elided>

|> Lets see ... I have set my Beacon Text to _Cookies are good with Milk_ and
|> I am digipeating this every seven minutes through four digipeaters in the
|> area. Who is violating which rules?

Clearly, you violate my rule "Cookies are good with cocoa."

How dare you attempt to convert people to the dark side with
that CLEARLY INCORRECT beacon?

(Let's bring this discussion back up to third grade level
where it clearly belongs)

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics Library Operations
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com "Parts 'R Us!"
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: Tue, 8 Nov 1994 07:49:56 GMT
From: orin@netcom.com (Orin Eman)

References<5I43j6Y.wcoyle@delphi.com> <391f98\$ipr@newsbf01.news.aol.com>,
<Cypy7w.J9s@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: 5wpm in 5days (or your money back!)

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Five days to get to 5wpm? I guess that just about kills the ``It's
>too difficult'' argument!

>Jeff NH6IL

That's about all it took me too, using the Radio Shack tapes. I did miss
a question on the exam though <g>.

Now I'm working towards the 13wpm; I passed the general theory at the
same time as the 5wpm (didn't even try 13wpm at the time).

Orin, KC7GIT

Date: 7 Nov 94 19:58:45 GMT

From: grw1@pge.com (Gary Wescom)

References<CyB5vA.9w8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38v7pf\$f8e@jupiter.planet.net>,
<390p0s\$pt6@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: Questions on this and that

In article <390p0s\$pt6@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>From: Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com
>Subject: Re: Questions on this and that
>Date: 30 Oct 94 18:35:08 GMT

>In article <38v7pf\$f8e@jupiter.planet.net>,
>Bill Sohl Budd Lake <billsohl@earth.planet.net> wrote:

>>

>>This (the shave & a haircut story) sounds like pure myth to me.
>>Anyone have any actual references (i.e. QST articles/story) to
>>back up this claim? Not meant as a flame, just want to
>>validate this story.

>Hi Bill, I can tell it like it was in the early 50's when I was a Novice
>(WN5DXP). The shave-and-a-haircut...six-bits thing was not used in place
>of a CQ. It was used only at the very end of a CW QSO after both stations
>had signed their 73's. It went like this:

>Station#1: ... 73 73 shave-and-a-haircut

>Station#2: six-bits shave-and-a-haircut

>Station#1: six-bits

>Over the years the shave-and-a-haircut part has been dropped and only the
>six-bits part remains. But in the early 50's, the majority of Novices signed
>as Stations 1 & 2 above. I've never heard shave-and-a-haircut used in place
>of CQ but I was inactive on CW from the mid-50's to the mid-80's.

>--

>73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

I was a novice in 1961. While shave-and-a-haircut was used as described above, what did happen occasionally was after two stations signed with the "." ". ." sequence, a third might jump in with the same to try to contact one of the previous qsoing stations. This is occasionally heard today with a third station echoing the ". ." of the signing stations.

Back in the early 60's though, "QRL?" was hardly ever heard and certainly I never heard in on the novice bands. Instead, a novice might use "." to mean the same thing as "QRL?". With the poor selectivity of the receivers we were using, a "." transmission really stood out and probably got as much

attention as a CQ (I could monitor a 25 Khz chunk of the 40 M novice band without retuning with my old SX-17). I know that a significant percentage of my novice QSOs were started that way.

The operating practices on the novice bands in 1961 are certainly different from those used today. They were adapted to the crystal controlled transmitter, broad as a barn door receiver selectivity, and 5 to 7 WPM operating speeds of that day. It worked just fine then. I wouldn't try to use those procedures today.

Gary Wescom N6CH
grw1@pge.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #523
